

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2013/2014: Cognitive Pretest

Lenzner, Timo; Neuert, Cornelia; Otto, Wanda

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Lenzner, T., Neuert, C., & Otto, W. (2013). *International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2013/2014: Cognitive Pretest*. (GESIS Project Reports, 2013/04). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.17173/pretest88>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

GESIS Project Reports

2013|04

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2013/2014

Cognitive Pretest
October 2013

Timo Lenzner, Cornelia Neuert & Wanda Otto

GESIS Project Reports 2013|04

International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2013/2014

Cognitive Pretest
October 2013

Timo Lenzner, Cornelia Neuert & Wanda Otto

GESIS Project Reports

GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Survey Design and Methodology
Postfach 12 21 55
68072 Mannheim

Phone: +49 (0) 621 1246 - 227 /- 225 /- 228

Fax: +49 (0) 621 1246 - 100

E-Mail: timo.lenzner@gesis.org / cornelia.neuert@gesis.org / wanda.otto@gesis.org

DOI: [10.17173/pretest88](https://doi.org/10.17173/pretest88)

Citation

Lenzner, T.; Neuert, C., & Otto, W. (2013). International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2013/2014. Cognitive Pretest. *GESIS Projektbericht*. Version: 1.0. GESIS – Pretestlabor. Text. <http://doi.org/10.17173/pretest88>

Contents

	Page
1 Aims of the Pretest.....	5
2 Sample.....	6
3 Methods.....	8
4 Results	9

1 Aims of the Pretest

The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is an international cooperation programme that conducts an annual joint survey on topics relevant to the social sciences. Since its foundation in 1984, the ISSP has grown to 48 member countries in 2013.

In order to prepare the ISSP surveys 2013 and 2014 in Germany and to check the translation of the questionnaires from English into German, selected parts of the two questionnaires should be subjected to a cognitive (laboratory) pretest under methodological and questionnaire technical aspects, revised on the basis of the test results and – where possible – improved.

For this purpose, the GESIS pretest laboratory was commissioned by the German ISSP project group to carry out the cognitive pretest. The contact person on the ISSP project group side was Dr. Evi Scholz.

2 Sample

Number of cognitive interviews: 20

Selection of target group: Quota sample

Quota plan: Only persons of legal age (18 years and older)

The test persons were selected according to age (18 - 40 years; 41 years and older), education (university entrance qualification/diploma (Abitur); no university entrance qualification (Abitur) and sex.

Age group	Education	Females	Males	Total
18 - 40	Less than university entrance qualification (Abitur)	2	2	4
18 - 40	University entrance qualification/ diploma	3	2	5
41 +	Less than university entrance qualification (Abitur)	4	3	7
41 +	University entrance qualification/ diploma	2	2	4
TOTAL		11	9	20

Key characteristics of the 20 test persons:

Test person ID	Sex m=male f=female	Age in years	School-leaving certificate*	Nationality
01	f	31	C	German
02	f	23	B	German
03	m	35	C	Italian
04	m	33	B	German
05	m	65	B	German
06	f	22	G	German
07	f	31	G	German
08	f	33	G	German
09	m	26	G	German
10	m	33	G	German
11	f	46	C	German
12	f	63	B	German
13	f	47	C	German
14	m	46	C	German
15	m	67	B	German
16	f	55	G	German
17	f	67	G	German
18	m	50	F	German
19	m	65	G	German
20	f	57	C	German

- * Codes:
- A - Dropped out of school without a secondary school leaving certificate (Volksschulabschluss)
 - B - Secondary School Certificate (Volksschulabschluss, Hauptschulabschluss)
 - C - Intermediate level (Realschulabschluss, Mittlere Reife)
 - D - Polytechnic secondary school of the GDR with completion of the 8th or 9th class
 - E - Polytechnic secondary school of the GDR with completion of the 10th grade
 - F - Advanced technical college entrance qualification (Fachhochschulreife)
 - G - General or subject-related university entrance qualification (Abitur, Grammar school or EOS, also EOS with apprenticeship)

3 Methods

Field time:	26 August to 18 September 2013
Number of cognitive interviewers:	3
Interviews conducted at the GESIS pretest lab (video recorded):	20
Procedure:	Use of an evaluation questionnaire
Used cognitive techniques:	Think Aloud, Comprehension Probing, General Probing, Specific Probing, Spontaneous requests.
Incentives for test persons:	30 Euro

4 Results

Question to be tested:

1. Wie oft nutzen Sie die Medien, d.h. Fernsehen, Zeitungen, Radio und Internet, um sich politisch zu informieren?

[How often do you use the media, i.e. television, newspapers, radio and Internet, to obtain political information?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)

[Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N=20)

Mehrmals am Tag [Several times a day]	9
Einmal am Tag [Once a day]	6
An 5-6 Tagen pro Woche [5 to 6 days a week]	1
An 3-4 Tagen pro Woche [3 to 4 days a week]	1
An 1-2 Tagen pro Woche [1 to 2 days a week]	1
An weniger als 1 Tag pro Woche [Less than 1 day per week]	2
Nie [Never]	-
Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]	-

Cognitive techniques:

Think Aloud, General Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

The majority of the test persons stated that they use the various media "several times a day" or "once a day" to obtain political information. The answer categories "never" and "I cannot say" were not chosen.

The test subjects associate three different ways of informing themselves politically with the term "informing themselves politically": seeing/reading/listening to news, informing themselves about general

political events (e.g. via a local newspaper) and informing themselves specifically about certain topics (e.g. the German federal elections). Watching/reading/listening to the news and informing yourself about general political events were mentioned 14 times. Three times, explicit reference was made to the upcoming Bundestag elections. In general, the test persons have a broad concept of "informing themselves politically", ranging from simply "listening" to news to regularly following political broadcasts. According to their objective, the question therefore works very well in this form.

One difference between the test subjects is the way they inform themselves politically: active versus passive. Ten respondents state that they inform themselves consciously or specifically about politics, while the other ten respondents, when answering the question, also consider situations in which they are informed unconsciously and incidentally.

Test person 10, for example, informs himself several times a day and does this consciously and specifically: *"I have now taken into account the conscious process for me here, where I really want to learn something and inform myself. Not so this subtle, the radio is on and you pick up something and you didn't have the need for information at all."*¹

Test person 08 also informs himself several times a day, but when answering the question, he also takes into account that he is also informed unconsciously and incidentally: *"Even the unconscious, I always listen to the radio in the morning and that is not aimed at informing me politically, but since news does come, you also hear events that you would not have thought of in this way."*

In general, the answers of the test subjects show that there is no connection between the way of informing (active versus passive) and the intensity of media use for the purpose of political information. In other words: Those who consciously and specifically obtain information do not use the media for this purpose to a greater or lesser extent than those who have also taken passive information into account.

Three test persons point out that it is difficult for them to find themselves in the answers. Test person 07 states that the answer categories are not mutually exclusive and that it is entirely conceivable that the media are used "several times a day" on "5-6 days a week" to obtain political information. The same difficulties with the answer scale arise for test person 16, while test person 17 forms an average value: *"Well, the days are not the same. On some days I use these media several times a day and on other days less. So, I would say "once a day", that would probably correspond to this. All in all, however, the difficulties expressed seem rather insignificant, since the three test subjects can be located on the response scale."*²

Recommendations:

Question: No changes recommended.

Response Options: No changes recommended.

¹ „Ich habe für mich jetzt hier den bewussten Prozess berücksichtigt, wo es mir wirklich darum geht etwas zu erfahren und mich zu informieren. Nicht so dieses Subtile, das Radio läuft und man nimmt etwas auf und hat gar nicht den Informationsbedarf gehabt.“ (TP 10)

² „Also die Tage sind ja nicht gleich. An manchen Tagen greife ich mehrfach am Tag zu diesen Medien und an anderen Tagen weniger. Deswegen würde ich sagen „einmal am Tag“, das würde dem wohl entsprechen.“ Insgesamt erscheinen die geäußerten Schwierigkeiten jedoch eher unbedeutend, da den drei Testpersonen eine Verortung auf der Antwortskala möglich ist.“ (TP 17)

Question to be tested:

2. Es gibt unterschiedliche Meinungen über die Rechte der Menschen in einer Demokratie. Benutzen Sie bitte für die folgenden Fragen die Skala von 1 bis 7. Der Wert 1 bedeutet überhaupt nicht wichtig, der Wert 7 sehr wichtig. Mit den Werten dazwischen können Sie Ihre Meinung abstimmen.

Wie wichtig ist es für Sie, ...

[There are different opinions about the rights of people in a democracy. Please use the scale from 1 to 7 for the following questions. 1 does not mean important at all, 7 is very important. With the values in between you can grade your opinion.

How important is it for you...]

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz!)

[Please put a cross in EVERY line!]

Frequency distribution (N = 20)

	Überhaupt nicht wichtig [Not im- portant at all]						Sehr wichtig [Very im- portant]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
a) dass alle Bürger einen ausreichenden Lebensstandard haben. [that all citizens have an adequate standard of living.]	-	-	1	-	1	2	15	1
b) dass Staat und Behörden die Rechte von Minderheiten achten und schützen. [that the State and authorities respect and protect the rights of minorities]	-	-	-	1	2	3	14	-
c) dass man den Menschen Möglichkeiten gibt, an politischen Entscheidungen teilzuhaben. [that people are given opportunities to participate in political decision-making.]	-	-	-	-	3	7	10	-
d) dass Bürger die Möglichkeit des zivilen Ungehorsams haben, um ihre deutliche Ablehnung gegen-	-	-	1	3	3	4	9	-

	Überhaupt nicht wichtig [Not im- portant at all]						Sehr wichtig [Very im- portant]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
über Regierungsentscheidungen zum Ausdruck zu bringen. [that citizens have the possibility of civil disobedience to express their clear opposition to government decisions.]								
e) dass Regierungen die demokrati- schen Rechte unter allen Umständen achten. [that governments respect demo- cratic rights under all circumstanc- es.]	-	-	-	-	5	3	12	-
f) dass Menschen, die wegen schwe- rer Verbrechen verurteilt wurden, ihre Bürgerrechte verlieren. [that people convicted of serious crimes lose their civil rights.]	5	2	4	3	-	2	1	3
g) dass Menschen, die schon lange in einem Land leben, aber dort nicht eingebürgert sind, das Recht haben, bei nationalen Wahlen ab- zustimmen. [that people who have lived in a country for a long time but are not naturalised there have the right to vote in national elections.]	4	2	3	5	2	2	1	1
h) dass Bürger das Recht haben, <u>nicht</u> zur Wahl zu gehen. ³ [that citizens have the right <u>not</u> to vote.]	-	-	3	3	1	3	9	-

³ Test person 01 does not give an answer because she cannot understand the meaning of the state-
ment: "Has it become compulsory to vote? This is free anyway, so the question is a bit strange. I
don't know what to check because it's a contradiction in terms." (TP 01)

[Testperson 01 vergibt keine Antwort, da Sie den Sinn der Aussage nicht nachvollziehen kann: „Ist es
mittlerweile Pflicht geworden, dass man wählt? Das steht ja sowieso frei, deswegen ist die Frage ein
bisschen komisch. Da weiß ich jetzt gar nicht, was ich ankreuzen soll, weil es irgendwie ein Wider-
spruch in sich ist.“ (TP 01)]

	Überhaupt nicht wichtig [Not im- portant at all]							Sehr wichtig [Very im- portant]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
i) dass jeder medizinische Versorgung erhält. [that everyone gets medical attention.]	-	-	-	-	-	4	16	-	

Cognitive techniques:

Comprehension Probing, General Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

When asked, 13 respondents stated that they had primarily thought about the rights of people in Germany and not generally about the rights of people in democracies (independent of individual countries) when answering the entire question 2. However, the interviews do not provide any indication that the answers of the test persons apply only to Germany. Rather, they give the impression that Germany automatically serves as a frame of reference, since people live in this very country and are primarily concerned with democracy in Germany.

Items d) and g) were tested systematically. For the other items only spontaneous reactions of the test subjects were available, if at all.

Item a): that all citizens have an adequate standard of living.

A respondent claims not to be able to answer item a) ("Can't say") and justifies his answer by saying that it is unclear to him what is meant by a "sufficient" standard of living. Her answer would be different depending on whether a sufficient standard of living meant that one "receives Hartz IV" or that everyone "has their own apartment or house"⁴.

Item d): that citizens have the possibility of civil disobedience to express their clear opposition to government decisions.

This item is predominantly classified as important or very important (n=16). Three test persons give the average value and one test person classifies the item as "rather not important".

⁴ Ihre Antwort würde unterschiedlich ausfallen, je nachdem ob ein ausreichender Lebensstandard bedeute, dass man „Hartz IV bekomme“ oder dass jeder „eine eigene Wohnung oder ein eigenes Haus habe.“

When answering statement d), four test persons spontaneously express difficulties in understanding the concept of civil disobedience:

- *"It's a bit complicated. What does that mean? You know what 'civil' and 'disobedient' is, but now in this context? What does it mean?"*⁵ (TP 01)
- *"What is meant by 'civil disobedience'?"*⁶ (TP 07)
- *"I would now understand that they will be allowed to demonstrate. Is that what you mean?"*⁷ (TP 11)
- *"How is civil disobedience defined?"*⁸ (TP 12)

The probing question of what the test subjects understand by the term 'civil disobedience' revealed that four other test subjects had difficulties in understanding the item. The main reason for this was that it was not clear to the test persons whether the term refers only to violent protest or also includes violent protests:

- *"It's really hard. I've been thinking about demonstrations or maybe collecting signatures in general. But I wonder if that's civil disobedience already? I wouldn't know if civil disobedience means that something is forbidden or if it's just a legal rebellion against a political decision."*⁹ (TP 06)
- *"I've become attached to the term. I found it difficult to formulate, because I thought, what is hidden behind it or what would I understand by it? What I had in mind was the right of assembly, demonstrations. That one should demonstrate in a civilian setting, i.e. peacefully and without violence, for example."*¹⁰ (TP 08)
- *"Civil disobedience ranges from destruction to house occupation. Destruction: no, squatting and protest rallies: yes. Maybe I am naive, but I would like it to be so that others are not harmed and that no property is destroyed. Randal is not one of them for me, so the answer is very difficult for me. Where is the border?"*¹¹ (TP 12) Test person 12 notes that your answer ("important", scale value 6) is only valid if the statement is about non-violent protest.
- *"I think of Stuttgart 21, of demonstrations. There are different kinds of 'civil disobedience'. For example, one can take part in non-violent demonstrations or in those where there is serious rioting. That's why I'm lying in the middle. I am already in favour of the citizens being*

⁵ „Das ist ein bisschen kompliziert. Was soll das bedeuten? Man weiß was ‚zivil‘ und ‚Ungehorsam‘ ist, aber jetzt in diesem Zusammenhang? Wie ist das gemeint?“ (TP 01)

⁶ „Was ist gemeint mit ‚zivilem Ungehorsam‘?“ (TP 07)

⁷ „Ich würde das jetzt so verstehen, dass die dann demonstrieren dürfen. Ist das so gemeint?“ (TP 11)

⁸ „Wie wird ‚ziviler Ungehorsam‘ definiert?“ (TP 12)

⁹ „Das ist echt schwierig. Ich habe jetzt an Demonstrationen gedacht oder generell vielleicht an Unterschriftensammlungen. Aber ob das jetzt schon ziviler Ungehorsam ist? Ich wüsste jetzt nicht genau, ob ziviler Ungehorsam bedeutet, dass etwas verboten ist oder ob es dabei nur um das legale Auflehnen gegen eine politische Entscheidung geht.“ (TP 06)

¹⁰ „An dem Begriff bin ich hängen geblieben. Den fand ich schwierig von der Formulierung her, weil ich gedacht habe, was verbirgt sich dahinter oder was würde ich darunter verstehen? Was ich mir vorgestellt habe, ist das Recht auf Versammlung, Demonstrationen. Dass man in einem zivilen Rahmen, also friedlich und gewaltfrei demonstriert, zum Beispiel.“ (TP 08)

¹¹ „Ziviler Ungehorsam erstreckt sich von Zerstörung bis Häuserbesetzung. Zerstörung: nein, Häuserbesetzung und Protestkundgebungen: ja. Vielleicht bin ich da naiv, aber ich hätte es gerne so, dass andere nicht zu Schaden kommen und dass kein Eigentum zerstört wird. Randal gehören für mich nicht dazu, deswegen ist die Beantwortung für mich ganz schwierig. Wo ist die Grenze?“ (TP 12)

*able to, or should, exercise the right to demonstrate, which is a fundamental right. But I reject violent demonstrations on principle."*¹² (TP 15)

Two test persons clearly misinterpret the term:

- *"That you might be a criminal? Not doing your job?"*¹³ (TP 03)
- *"Sounds to me like this isn't about demonstration. Civil disobedience, that's something you do against the law. And I don't think that's so okay now. Smashing windows or something or demolishing cars, in anger or in protest."*¹⁴ (TP 13)

Due to this misinterpretation, these two test persons state that this right is rather not important for people in a democracy (scale values 3 and 4).

The remaining ten test persons interpret the term civil disobedience mainly as non-violent protest and understand it to mean forms of protest such as strikes and demonstrations.

The difficulties that arise in answering statement d) due to the concept of "civil disobedience" are also illustrated by the fact that half of the test persons (n=10) state that they found it "rather difficult" or "very difficult" to answer the statement due to the concept of "rather difficult" or "very difficult".

Item f): that people convicted of serious crimes lose their civil rights.

Four subjects (TP 05, TP 07, TP 10, TP 13) indicate that they have difficulty finding the correct scale value to express that they do not want "people to lose their civil rights":

- *"How important is it to me that they lose? It's not important to me. You know, it's a little weird to ask. You somehow have the feeling that you have to do it the other way [on the scale], but I understand it now, every citizen has civil rights, even if he has committed crimes, so I don't want him to lose them."*¹⁵ (TP 07)
- *"There I have a little problem with the scale, so 'not important at all'. I don't think it's important that people say stop, that they lose it, or I think it's very important that they lose it. [...] I also think it is important that they don't lose them. I have a problem to find the right answer immediately, because for me it is very important that they don't lose them. For me, there is an unrecognizable negation built into this. So then it's actually not important at all, because they shouldn't lose it."*¹⁶ (TP 10)

¹² Da denke ich an Stuttgart 21, an Demonstrationen. Es gibt unterschiedliche Arten von ‚zivilem Ungehorsam‘. Bspw. kann man an gewaltlosen Demonstrationen teilnehmen oder aber auch an welchen bei denen es zu schweren Ausschreitungen kommt. Daher liege ich so in der Mitte. Ich bin schon dafür, dass die Bürger das Demonstrationsrecht, welches ein Grundrecht ist, wahrnehmen können bzw. sollen. Aber ich lehne gewaltsame Demonstrationen grundsätzlich ab." (TP 15)

¹³ „Dass man straffällig wird vielleicht? Dass man seinen Pflichten nicht nachgeht?" (TP 03)

¹⁴ „Das hört sich für mich so an, als ob es hier nicht um Demonstration geht. Ziviler Ungehorsam, das ist etwas, was man gegen das Gesetz macht. Und das finde ich jetzt nicht so ok. [...] Fensterscheiben einschlagen oder so etwas oder Autos demolieren, aus Wut oder aus Protest." (TP 13)

¹⁵ „Wie wichtig ist mir das, dass die sie verlieren?? Das ist mir nicht wichtig. Die finde ich ein bisschen komisch die Frage. Man hat irgendwie das Gefühl, man muss es in die andere Richtung machen [auf der Skala], aber ich verstehe es jetzt so, die Bürgerrechte hat ja jeder Bürger, auch wenn er Verbrechen begangen hat, deswegen möchte ich nicht, dass er die verliert." (TP 07)

¹⁶ „Da habe ich so ein bisschen ein Problem mit der Skala, also ‚überhaupt nicht wichtig‘. Dass man halt sagt, finde ich nicht wichtig, dass die die verlieren oder finde ich sehr wichtig, dass sie die verlieren.

Four other test persons (TP 03, TP 08, TP 09, TP 17), three of whom replied "I can't tell", make the spontaneous comment that they do not know whether this statement corresponds to reality or not. Furthermore, they claim that they are not clear which rights are meant by "civil rights":

- *„I think that if you have committed serious crimes, you should be convicted, but I am not sure that you should lose civil rights as a result. I can't find-- There might be an example to be given.“¹⁷ (TP 08)*
- *„Do I understand correctly that people convicted of serious crimes lose their civil rights? I'm not really that informed. Do they lose all their rights? I can't tell you that, I don't have enough information. I think he will certainly retain some of his rights. But here it says 'lose their civil rights' and that sounds like everyone. But he doesn't lose them all. I don't know, I can't say.“¹⁸ (TP 17)*

Item g): that people who have lived in a country for a long time but are not naturalized there have the right to vote in national elections.

The test persons use the entire scale width. Only one test person (TP 03) answers with "Can't say" and justifies his answer by saying that he wants to abstain from this statement.

The term "national elections" is not interpreted by the test persons in the intended sense (national elections in different countries), but in the sense of "elections within Germany". The test persons think of very different elections (or combinations of elections). They are called the Bundestag elections (4 nominations), Bundestag and local elections (4 nominations), Bundestag and state elections (4 nominations), Bundestag and European elections (1 nomination), district or local elections (2 nominations) and all elections in Germany (5 nominations) The choices made in Germany are the frame of reference for the respondents when answering the item, although this is not necessarily means that the Answers of the test persons are only valid for Germany. The interviews do not provide any indications that the test persons have a different attitude to voting rights in other countries (see findings on the question as a whole).

Problematic, however, is the finding that three test persons explicitly think of local elections and not national (i.e. nationwide) elections when answering the item. Their answers would be quite different if they were to interpret the item in the intended sense:

- *„If the mayor is to be elected, then I think they should be allowed to participate. If you live in Mannheim for 20 years and it is an election, then you should have the right to vote. If the Federal Chancellor is elected, then one can already say that citizenship is necessary. In re-*

[...] Ich finde es auch wichtig, dass die sie nicht verlieren. Ich habe da jetzt ein Problem sofort die richtige Antwortoption zu finden, weil für mich ist es sehr wichtig, dass die sie nicht verlieren. Für mich ist da eine nicht erkennbare Negation eingearbeitet. Also dann ist es eigentlich ‚überhaupt nicht wichtig‘, weil die sollen sie nicht verlieren.“ (TP 10)

¹⁷ „Ich denke, wenn man Schwere Verbrechen begangen hat, muss man verurteilt werden, aber ich bin mir nicht sicher, ob man dadurch die Bürgerrechte verlieren sollte. Kann ich nicht einschätzen. Da müsste vielleicht ein Beispiel genannt werden.“ (TP 08)

¹⁸ „Verstehe ich das richtig, dass Menschen, die wegen schwerer Verbrechen verurteilt wurden, ihre Bürgerrechte verlieren? Bin ich jetzt gar nicht so informiert. Verliert man da alle Rechte? Das kann ich nicht sagen, da fehlt es mir an Informationen. Ich denke, er behält sicherlich einen Teil seiner Rechte. Aber hier steht ja ‚ihre Bürgerrechte verlieren‘ und das klingt ja wie alle. Aber er verliert nicht alle. Das weiß ich nicht, das kann ich nicht sagen.“ (TP 17)

*gional elections: yes, in national elections: no."*¹⁹ (TP 09, answer: "rather important", scale value 5)

- *„For example, within a city district. That people who live in that city already have a right to participate, not in all matters. That's why I didn't turn further to the right, in part you have the right. Not federal elections, but limited to a residential area."*²⁰ (TP 19, answer: "moderately important", scale value 4)
- *„I have thought about elections that affect the immediate surroundings, such as the state parliament, the election of mayors. For the Bundestag elections, I don't think it's like that, you should be naturalized. For the federal elections I would have answered it differently. It was clear to me that it refers to the local environment."*²¹ (TP 20, answer: "important", scale value 6)

Recommendations:

Question: No changes recommended.

Item a): No changes recommended.

Item d): Rephrase into:
 „that citizens have the possibility of non-violent protest to express their clear opposition to government decisions."
 Or shorter and easier for respondents to understand:
 „that citizens have the opportunity to protest government decisions without violence."

Item f): The term "civil rights" should be specified by using several items, each dealing with a civil right, e.g:

1. „that people convicted of serious crimes lose the right to vote."
2. „that people convicted of serious crimes lose the right to petition."
3. „..." etc.

Item g): Rephrase into:
 „that people who have lived in a country for a long time but are not naturalized there have the right to vote in national elections."

¹⁹ „Wenn der Bürgermeister gewählt werden soll, dann glaube ich schon, dass sie teilnehmen dürfen sollten. Wenn man 20 Jahre in Mannheim wohnt und es sind Wahlen, dann sollte man schon das Rechte haben, wählen zu dürfen. Wenn der Bundeskanzler gewählt wird, dann kann man schon sagen, dass dafür die Staatsbürgerschaft notwendig ist. Bei den regionalen Wahlen: ja, bei den nationalen Wahlen: nein." (TP 09, Antwort: „eher wichtig", Skalenwert 5)

²⁰ „Zum Beispiel innerhalb von einem Stadtteil. Dass Leute, die in dieser Stadt wohnen, schon das Recht haben mitzubestimmen, nicht in allen Belangen. Deswegen habe ich mich auch nicht weiter nach rechts orientiert, zum Teil haben Sie das Recht. Also nicht Bundestagswahlen, sondern ganz begrenzt auf einen Wohnbereich." (TP 19, Antwort: „mittelmäßig wichtig", Skalenwert 4)

²¹ „Ich habe an Wahlen gedacht, die das direkte Umfeld betreffen, wie Landtag, Bürgermeisterwahl. [...] Für die Bundestagswahl, da halte ich es für nicht so, da sollte man sich schon einbürgern lassen. Bei der Bundestagswahl hätte ich es anders beantwortet. Für mich war klar, dass es sich auf das kommunale Umfeld bezieht." (TP 20, Antwort: „wichtig", Skalenwert 6)

Question to be tested:

3. Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?
 [To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?]

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz!)
 [Please put a cross in EVERY line!]

Frequency distribution (N = 20)

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
a) Ich möchte lieber ein Bürger/eine Bürgerin Deutschlands als irgendeines anderen Landes auf der Welt sein. [I would rather be a citizen of Germany than of any other country in the world.]	4	8	5	-	-	3
b) Es gibt einige Dinge im heutigen Deutschland, derentwegen ich mich für Deutschland schäme. [There are some things in Germany to- day that make me ashamed of Germa- ny.]	6	8	-	4	2	-
c) Die Welt wäre besser, wenn die Men- schen in anderen Ländern eher so wären wie die Deutschen. [The world would be a better place if people in other countries were more like the Germans.]	-	5	4	4	5	2
d) Im Großen und Ganzen ist Deutsch- land ein besseres Land als die meisten anderen Länder. [By and large, Germany is a better coun- try than most other countries.]	2	6	7	2	2	1
e) Jede/r sollte ihr/sein Land unterstüt- zen, selbst wenn sich das Land im Un- recht befindet. [Everyone should support their country, even if the country is in the wrong.]	-	-	2	8	9	1

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
f) Wenn mein Land Erfolg im internationalen Sport hat, macht mich das stolz, ein Deutscher/eine Deutsche zu sein. [If my country has success in international sports, I am proud to be a German.]	-	6	6	2	2	4
g) Ich bin oft weniger stolz auf Deutschland, als ich es gerne wäre. [I am often less proud of Germany than I would like to be.]	2	2	6	7	2	1
h) Die Welt wäre besser, wenn die Deutschen zugeben würden, dass in Deutschland nicht alles zum Besten steht. [The world would be a better place if the Germans would admit that not everything is at its best in Germany.]	-	4	2	5	4	5

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

Item h) was systematically tested. For the other items, only spontaneous reactions of the test subjects were available, if at all.

Item a): I would rather be a citizen of Germany than of any other country in the world.

Three test persons stated that they could not answer item a) ("I cannot say"). One respondent (TP 05) justifies his answer by saying that he would rather be a European citizen, but that citizenship is a national category. Another respondent (TP 10) argues that he/she has no comparison with other countries and therefore cannot say whether he/she would have liked to become a citizen of another country. Similarly, subject 13 explains her response behavior: "*There are advantages and disadvantages in every country. I am German, but I would never say that I would rather live in Germany than in another country. This is my home country, but if it turns out to be, I'll live abroad, too.*"²²

²² „Es gibt in jedem Land Vor- und Nachteile. Ich bin Deutsche, aber ich würde nie sagen, dass ich lieber in Deutschland leben würde, als in einem anderen Land. Das ist meine Heimat, aber wenn sich das ergibt, lebe ich auch im Ausland.“ (TP 13)

Item c): The world would be a better place if people in other countries were more like the Germans.

Two test persons (TP 06, TP 07) state that they cannot say whether the world would be a better place if everyone had "German virtues" (TP 06).

Three other test persons decide on an answer category, but criticize that it is unclear to them what the question is aimed at: *"Is it the people or the system in Germany?"*²³ (TP 09). Test person 10 also addresses this ambiguity: *"I am of the opinion that many things that are going quite well here institutionally, I would grant other countries and thus other people somewhere, that it is the same there [...] But I don't know whether this is really the achievement of the people or whether one doesn't have to say that it is the whole country that is developing in a certain direction. That's why I have 'Neither' [stated], but I could have also ticked 'I cannot say'."*²⁴

Test subject 19 ("disagree") vacillates between agreement and disagreement, depending on the intention of the item: *"If I understood that people in the world were better off, I would say I agree, but that people themselves were better off, I disagree."*²⁵

In total, a quarter of the test subjects make it clear that the item is formulated too imprecisely for them. This is mainly due to the formulation *"The world would be better"*, which is not understood by some test subjects in the intended sense or whose meaning is unclear to some test subjects (What would be better? Would the people themselves be better? Do "German virtues" have an influence on the welfare of the world? – see also findings on item h).

Item f): When my country has success in international sport, I am proud to be a German.

Four test persons (TP 01, TP 05, TP 07, TP 10) state that they cannot answer the question ("Can't say"). The main reason given for this is that the phrase "proud to be a German" is not correct. They are happy when German athletes perform well, but see these successes independent of the fact of being German: *"I am a great sports patriot and am always happy when a German athlete wins or wins the national team, but that does not make me proud to be German."* (TP 07)²⁶

Test person 09 also finds the phrase "proud to be a German" problematic and therefore uses the "neither nor" category as a hidden "can't say" option: *"It makes you proud because you see the effort behind it, you are happy with the team, you see the success, you can be happy with the team. But to be a German right away? It's too national for me."*²⁷

²³ „Sind damit die Menschen oder das System in Deutschland gemeint?“ (TP 09).

²⁴ „Ich bin der Meinung, dass viele Dinge, die hier institutionell ganz gut laufen, das würde ich anderen Ländern und damit auch anderen Menschen irgendwo gönnen, dass es da auch so ist [...] Aber ich weiß nicht, ob das wirklich die Leistung der Menschen ist oder ob man nicht da sagen muss, das ist das ganze Land, das sich in eine bestimmte Richtung entwickelt. Daher habe ich da ‚Weder noch‘ [angegeben], hätte aber auch ‚Kann ich nicht sagen‘ ankreuzen können.“ (TP 10)

²⁵ „Wenn ich es so verstehen würde, dass es den Menschen in der Welt besser ginge, dann würde ich sagen da stimme ich zu, aber dass die Menschen selbst besser wären, da stimme ich nicht zu.“ (TP 19)

²⁶ „Ich bin ein ganz großer Sportpatriot und freue mich immer, wenn ein deutscher Sportler gewinnt oder die Nationalmannschaft gewinnt, aber das macht mich nicht stolz, Deutscher zu sein.“ (TP 07)

²⁷ „Es macht einen stolz, weil man den Aufwand dahinter sieht, man freut sich mit der Mannschaft, sieht den Erfolg, man kann sich mit der Mannschaft freuen. Aber gleich ein Deutscher zu sein? Das ist mir zu national.“ (TP 09)

This shows that at least five of the 20 test persons are annoyed by the phrase "proud to be a German" and therefore do not (want to) answer the question.

Item h): The world would be a better place if the Germans would admit that not everything is for the best in Germany.

Eleven test persons do not agree or do not agree at all with the statement, two test persons choose the answer category "neither nor" and four agree with the statement. The answer "Fully agree" is not given. A total of five respondents choose the answer category "Can't say."

When asked how easy or difficult they found the answer to the question, nine respondents state that they found it "rather difficult" (n=6) or "very difficult" (n=3). The reason for this is due to an insufficient understanding of the question. Test person 04, for example, says that at first, he or she does not know what the question is supposed to lead to. Three other test persons cite similar reasons:

- *„Because I just had to read it 1,000 more times to understand the sentence.“²⁸ (TP 02)*
- *„The question is challenging.“²⁹ (TP 03)*
- *"You have to think a little bit more about the question. "You mustn't be too hasty to check your box."³⁰ (TP 15)*

All test subjects understood the negation "that not everything is in the best condition in Germany". However, not all test subjects take into account the postulated causal relationship between "admitting that not everything is fine in Germany" and the consequence that the world would be a better place. Only three test persons (TP 12, TP 15, TP 20) are of the opinion that not everything is fine in Germany, that this should be admitted and that this is related to a better state of the world.

Twelve test persons cannot see a connection between admitting the state of affairs in Germany and the welfare of the world:

- *„If the Germans would admit that not everything is good, for me this has nothing to do with world events.“³¹ (TP 02)*
- *„It is certainly the case that not everything is perfect in Germany, but what do the other countries get out of it?“³² (TP 04)*
- *„I can't think of anything that would change if Germany were now to say that not everything is fine here.“³³ (TP 06)*
- *„The world would not become a better place if we said that we are also bad.“³⁴ (TP 10)*

²⁸ „Weil ich es mir einfach noch 1.000 Mal durchlesen musste, um den Satz zu verstehen.“ (TP 02)

²⁹ „Die Fragestellung ist anspruchsvoll.“ (TP 03)

³⁰ „Man muss ein bisschen mehr nachdenken bei der Frage. Man darf nicht voreilig sein Kreuzchen machen.“ (TP 15)

³¹ „Wenn die Deutschen zugeben würden, dass nicht alles gut ist, das hat für mich überhaupt nichts mit dem Weltgeschehen zu tun.“ (TP 02)

³² „Wenn die Deutschen zugeben würden, dass nicht alles gut ist, das hat für mich überhaupt nichts mit dem Weltgeschehen zu tun.“ (TP 02)

³³ „Mir fällt jetzt auch nichts ein, das sich ändert würde, wenn Deutschland jetzt sagen würde, es steht hier nicht alles zum Besten.“ (TP 06)

³⁴ „Die Welt würde nicht besser dadurch werden, wenn wir sagen würden, wir sind auch schlecht.“ (TP 10)

The remaining five test persons (TP 01, TP 03, TP 05, TP 08, TP 14) only consider the second part of the statement "if the Germans would admit that not everything is for the best in Germany" and do not make a connection with the effects, i.e. whether the world would be a better place:

- „Germany is not doing well and Germany should admit it.“³⁵ (TP 01)
- „We have to admit that not everything is for the best with us.“³⁶ (TP 05)
- „With our unemployment and the Hartz IV, you can certainly do a little something about it. We don't have all the glittering gold.“³⁷ (TP 14)

These five test persons thus completely hide a central aspect of the statement and therefore answer only a part of the item.

In addition, four test persons doubt the underlying assumption of the item that not everything is at its best in Germany. There is also the view that everything is fine in Germany:

- „The whole picture in Germany is great and outstanding, seen in this light everything is already 'at its best'.“³⁸ (TP 03)
- „People in Germany are much better off than in other countries. That's a sign that we have made it far in our country.“³⁹ (TP 19)

The formulation of the item does not allow the test persons to express that, by and large, everything is fine in Germany.

In summary, the item should be modified in several places to ensure that the underlying construct (negative facet of national pride) is actually measured. Firstly, it is important to make it clear that this item is not about concrete effects on the welfare of the world, but rather about an abstract improvement of the overall situation. On the other hand, it must be made clear that respondents should not state for themselves whether they admit this or not, but that they should take Germany as a whole into account in their response. Finally, it should be made clear that the point of this item is that Germany concedes to other countries that not everything is for the best in this country either.

Recommendations:

- Question: No changes recommended.
- Item a): No changes recommended.
- Item c): Possibly reformulate into:
 „The world would be a better place if people in other countries were more like the Germans.“
 [„Die Welt wäre eine bessere, wenn die Menschen in anderen Ländern eher so wären wie die Deutschen.“]

³⁵ „Deutschland steht nicht gut da und Deutschland soll das zugeben.“ (TP 01)

³⁶ „Wir sollten schon zugeben, dass bei uns nicht alles zum Besten steht.“ (TP 05)

³⁷ „Mit unserer Arbeitslosigkeit und dem Hartz IV, da kann man mit Sicherheit auch ein bisschen was machen. Da ist bei uns auch nicht alles Gold was glänzt.“ (TP 14)

³⁸ „Das ganze Anschauungsbild in Deutschland ist toll und hervorragend, so gesehen steht in Deutschland schon alles ‚zum Besten‘.“ (TP 03)

³⁹ „Den Menschen in Deutschland geht es viel besser als in anderen Ländern. Das ist ja ein Zeichen dafür, dass wir es weit gebracht haben in unserem Land.“ (TP 19)

Item f): As previous pretests have already shown, the formulation "proud to be German" is problematic due to German history and is met with rejection on the part of the test persons. In this pretest, too, the test persons in the extreme case state that they are "proud of Germany" but not "proud to be German". We therefore propose the following rewording:

"I am proud of Germany when my country is successful in international sport."

[„Ich bin stolz auf Deutschland, wenn mein Land Erfolg im internationalen Sport hat.“]

Item h): Reformulate into:

„The world would be a better place if Germany were to admit that not everything is for the best in this country.“

[„Die Welt wäre eine bessere, wenn Deutschland einräumen würde, dass hierzulande auch nicht alles zum Besten steht.“]

Question to be tested:

4. Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?

[To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?]

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz!)

[Please put a cross in EVERY line!]

Frequency distribution (N = 20)

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
a) In Deutschland schaden internationale Konzerne zunehmend den Firmen vor Ort. [In Germany, international corporations are increasingly harming local companies.]	2	7	5	-	2	4
b) Der freie Welthandel bedeutet, dass in Deutschland bessere Produkte erhältlich sind. [Free world trade means that better products are available in Germany.]	1	8	3	5	3	-
c) Deutschland sollte im Allgemeinen als Mitglied internationaler Organisationen deren Entscheidungen befolgen, selbst wenn die deutsche Regierung die Entscheidung nicht für richtig hält. [Germany, as a member of international organizations, should generally comply with their decisions, even if the German government does not consider the decision to be correct.]	-	6	3	6	3	2
d) Internationale Organisationen nehmen der deutschen Regierung zu viel Macht weg. [International organizations take away too much power from the German government.]	1	3	2	9	1	4

	Stimme voll und ganz zu	Stimme zu	Weder noch	Stimme nicht zu	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Kann ich nicht sagen
	[Strongly agree]	[Agree]	[Neither nor]	[Disagree]	[Strongly disagree]	[Don't know]
e) Ich fühle mich eher als Weltbürger und somit verbunden mit der Welt insgesamt und weniger als Bürger eines bestimmten Landes. [I feel more like a citizen of the world and thus connected to the world as a whole and less like a citizen of a certain country.]	2	4	3	5	6	-

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Comprehension Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

Item e) was systematically tested. For the other items, only spontaneous reactions of the test persons are available, if at all.

Item a): In Germany, international corporations are increasingly harming local companies.

A total of six test persons, spontaneously or when asked, stated that they did not have sufficient information or knowledge to answer this statement. Four of these test persons answer "Can't say" (TP 01, TP 03, TP 07, TP 13), two test persons (TP 09, TP 20) "Neither". For these last two subjects, the middle category acts as a hidden "Can't say" option.

Another test person (TP 06) spontaneously comments that it is unclear to her whether the statement refers to international corporations that also (i.e. additionally) operate in Germany or only to international corporations that are based abroad.

Item d): International organizations take too much power away from the German government.

Four test subjects answer "I can't tell" in this statement. Of these, two test persons (TP 01, TP 11) state that they do not have the knowledge to answer this question. The other two subjects (TP 09, TP 10) justify their answer by stating that it is unclear to them which organizations are meant in the statement:

- „Which organisations are being considered here? The European Community can also be seen as an organisation and I think that Germany has gained power.“⁴⁰ (TP 09)

⁴⁰ „An welche Organisationen wird hier gedacht? Die Europäische Gemeinschaft kann man auch als Organisation sehen und da finde ich, dass Deutschland an Macht gewonnen hat.“ (TP 09)

- „Because simply 'international organisations' is too vague. International organisations can be the ECB, the UN, and I cannot grasp what is behind them. When it comes to Europeanisation, I would say 'agree completely', but that is not defined here.“⁴¹ (TP 10)

Item e): I feel more like a citizen of the world and thus connected to the world at large and less like a citizen of a particular country.

The test persons use the full range of scales.

The term "citizen of the world" is misinterpreted by three test persons in the sense of "multicultural society" or "world population" or understood as if one had a responsibility as a German to inform oneself about world events and to engage in civic engagement:

- „The world has become our guest and part of our lives in so many different ways that I think I can see myself more connected to the world.“⁴² (TP 12)
- „All people on planet earth, everyone who lives here on earth is a citizen of the world.“⁴³ (TP 18)
- „All in all, I think that here in Germany I am also part of a whole, i.e. part of the whole world and therefore also responsible for the whole world. All in all, as a German I feel an obligation to the whole world and I'm not sitting here and I don't care what happens in Timbuktu.“⁴⁴ (TP 20)

With three other test persons it remains unclear whether they understood the term "citizen of the world" in the intended, i.e. cosmopolitan, sense or not. Two of these test persons (TP 06, TP 13) associate the term with a geographical rather than an emotional connection. Moreover, they feel the term to be too vague or too broad and reinterpret the statement for themselves by replacing the term "citizen of the world" with "European":

- „I have transferred it to the EU for me because I think it is even more tangible. In any case, I feel as a European and would not say that German interests are above everything. As a citizen of the world it is of course more difficult, because there are already great cultural differences [...].“⁴⁵ (TP 06)

⁴¹ „Weil einfach ‚internationale Organisationen‘ zu schwammig ist. Internationale Organisationen können EZB, die UNO sein, und das ist nicht greifbar für mich, was sich dahinter versteckt. Wenn es um die Europäisierung geht, dann würde ich sagen, ‚Stimme voll und ganz zu‘, aber hier wird das nicht definiert.“ (TP 10)

⁴² „Die Welt ist in so vielfältiger Form bei uns zu Gast als auch schon Teil unseres Lebens geworden, so dass ich denke, dass ich mich da eher als verbunden mit der Welt sehen kann.“ (TP 12)

⁴³ „Alle Menschen auf dem Planeten Erde, jeder der hier auf der Erde lebt ist ein Weltbürger.“ (TP 18)

⁴⁴ „Insgesamt finde ich, ich bin hier in Deutschland auch Teil eines Ganzen, also Teil der ganzen Welt und deswegen auch verantwortlich für die ganze Welt. Im Großen und Ganzen fühle ich mich als Deutsche auch der ganzen Welt verpflichtet und sitze nicht hier und es interessiert mich nicht, was in Timbuktu passiert.“ (TP 20)

⁴⁵ „Ich habe es für mich auf die EU übertragen, weil ich finde, das ist noch eher greifbar. Ich fühle mich auf jeden Fall als Europäerin und würde nicht sagen, dass die deutschen Interessen über alles gehen. Als Weltbürger ist es natürlich schwieriger, weil es da schon große kulturelle Unterschiede gibt [...].“ (TP 06)

- „I feel like a European. Citizen of the world is a great concept. I don't feel like African, Chinese or Indian.“⁴⁶ (TP 13)

The third respondent (TP 03) justifies her answer ("Agree") with her migrant background, which means that she is to a certain extent always between two countries and does not feel connected to only one country.

Since five of the six test persons who misinterpret the statement or with whom it remains unclear whether they have understood the item in the intended sense agree with the statement or answer "neither nor", there is a risk that this misinterpretation leads to a distortion of the answers and that the proportion of those who actually feel like "citizens of the world" is overestimated.

Recommendations:

- Question: No changes recommended.
- Item a): To clarify the focus of the item and ideally reduce the number of "Can't say" answers, the item should be reworded:
- "Large international corporations are increasingly harming small companies in Germany."
- [„Große internationale Konzerne schaden zunehmend den kleinen Unternehmen in Deutschland.“]
- Item d): The term 'international organizations' could be specified by listing examples (e.g. United Nations, World Trade Organization, European Union, European Central Bank):
- "International organizations like [...] are taking too much power away from the German government."
- [„Internationale Organisationen wie die [...] nehmen der deutschen Regierung zu viel Macht weg.“]
- Item e): Reformulate into:
- "I feel more connected to the world at large and less like a citizen of a particular country."
- [„Ich fühle mich eher mit der Welt insgesamt verbunden und weniger als Bürger eines bestimmten Landes.“]

⁴⁶ „Ich fühle mich als Europäer. Weltbürger ist ein großer Begriff. Ich fühle eher mich nicht als Afrikaner, Chinese oder Inder.“ (TP 13)

Question to be tested:

5. Es gibt unterschiedliche Meinungen zu Zuwanderern, die aus anderen Ländern nach Deutschland kommen, um auf Dauer hier zu leben. Inwieweit stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu oder nicht zu?

[There are different opinions about immigrants who come to Germany from other countries to live here permanently. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?]

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz.)

[Please put a cross in EVERY line.]

Frequency distribution (N = 20)

	Stimme voll und ganz zu	Stimme zu	Weder noch	Stimme nicht zu	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Kann ich nicht sagen
	[Strongly agree]	[Agree]	[Neither nor]	[Disagree]	[Strongly disagree]	[Don't know]
a) Zuwanderer erhöhen die Kriminalitätsrate. [Immigrants increase the crime rate.]	-	7	3	6	3	1
b) Zuwanderer sind im Allgemeinen gut für die deutsche Wirtschaft. [Immigrants are generally good for the German economy.]	-	7	5	2	1	5
c) Zuwanderer nehmen Menschen, die in Deutschland geboren sind, Arbeitsplätze weg. [Immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in Germany.]	1	2	4	6	5	2
d) Zuwanderer bereichern Deutschland durch neue Ideen und Kulturen. [Immigrants enrich Germany with new ideas and cultures.]	5	12	2	1	-	-
e) Die deutsche Kultur wird im Allgemeinen von Zuwanderern untergraben. [German culture is generally undermined by immigrants.]	-	2	4	10	3	1

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
f) Personen ohne deutsche Staats- angehörigkeit, die legal nach Deutsch- land gekommen sind, sollten die glei- chen Rechte haben wie deutsche Staatsangehörige. [Persons without German citizenship who came to Germany legally should have the same rights as German citi- zens.]	3	3	3	8	2	1
g) Deutschland sollte härtere Maß- nahmen ergreifen, um illegale Zu- wanderer abzuwehren. [Germany should take harder measures to ward off illegal immigrants.]	4	5	2	5	1	3
h) Legale Zuwanderer sollten die gleichen Möglichkeiten einer Schul- bildung haben wie die Deutschen. [Legal immigrants should have the same opportunities for education as Germans.]	12	8	-	-	-	-

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing, Comprehension Probing.

Findings:

Items e) and h) were systematically tested. For the other items, only spontaneous reactions of the test subjects were available, if at all.

Item b): Immigrants are generally good for the German economy.

A total of five test persons stated that they could not answer item b) ("Can't say"). Four of these five test persons have difficulties with the interpretation of the term "immigrant", which they find too imprecise: "immigrant" is too general a term, one has to distinguish between different groups of immigrants. The following two quotations illustrate this problem:

- „Depending on what kind of immigrants. 200,000 Spaniards with a degree, some training, that's an asset. But when 200,000 unemployed people come from Bulgaria who have no

*school education, then there is a lack of quality and that is not an enrichment, not even for the German economy. I cannot say, I do not know who is immigrating."*⁴⁷ (TP 09)

- *"I can't tell you at all, because I don't know. Because the term "immigrant" is too vague for me. Are they legal or illegal immigrants? All illegals are bad for us. We needed them, we got them. But illegals are first of all a cost factor."*⁴⁸ (TP 12)

The same difficulties with the general concept of "immigrants" arise – albeit to a lesser extent – in answering items (a) and (c). Here are two examples:

- *"The collective term of immigrants is the problem, some groups are like that, others are not. This cannot be said per se."*⁴⁹ (TP 10, Item a))
- *"How? That's nonsense [...] If a mechanical engineer comes from Spain, speaks perfect English and wants his 2,000 euros and I want my 4,000, then my job is taken away. It's true. It depends on the qualification. With a high qualification: yes. But there is also the other side."*⁵⁰ (TP 09, Item c))

Item e): German culture is generally undermined by immigrants.

Most of the test persons do not agree or do not agree at all with this statement. Only two test persons answer "agree".

The term "undermining culture" is interpreted correctly by 18 of the 20 test persons, i.e. in the sense that immigrants represent a threat or danger to the continued existence of German culture or that German culture can be lost through immigration. These 18 test persons also correctly interpret item e) as the opposite pole to item d) ("Immigrants affect Germany...").

Four of the 18 test persons associate the term with the "active" repression or destruction of German culture:

- *"There are immigrants who undermine German culture. There are those who come to us and don't want to allow us to live out our culture, for example by removing crucifixes from classrooms. It's not possible!"*⁵¹ (TP 04)

⁴⁷ „Je nachdem was für Zuwanderer. 200.000 Spanier mit einem akademischen Grad, einer gewissen Ausbildung, das ist eine Bereicherung. Aber wenn jetzt 200.000 Arbeitslose aus Bulgarien kommen, die keine Schulbildung haben, dann fehlt es an Qualität und dann ist das keine Bereicherung, auch nicht für die deutsche Wirtschaft. Kann ich nicht sagen, ich weiß ja nicht, wer zuwandert.“ (TP 09)

⁴⁸ „Kann ich überhaupt nicht sagen, weil ich es nicht weiß. Weil mir der Begriff ‚Zuwanderer‘ wieder zu schwammig ist. Sind das legale oder illegale Zuwanderer? Alle Illegalen tun uns eigentlich nicht gut. Legale, die haben wir gebraucht, die haben wir geholt. Aber Illegalen sind zunächst einmal Kostenverursacher.“ (TP 12)

⁴⁹ „Der Sammelbegriff der Zuwanderer ist das Problem, bei einigen Gruppen ist es so, bei anderen nicht. Das kann man nicht per se sagen.“ (TP 10, Item a))

⁵⁰ „Wie denn? Das ist Schwachsinn [...] Wenn ein Maschinenbauer aus Spanien kommt, perfekt Englisch spricht und der will seine 2.000 Euro und ich will meine 4.000, dann nimmt der meinen Arbeitsplatz weg. Das stimmt. Das ist abhängig von der Qualifikation. Bei einer hohen Qualifikation: ja. Aber es gibt ja auch die andere Seite.“ (TP 09, Item c))

⁵¹ „Es gibt Zuwanderer, die die deutsche Kultur unterwandern. Es gibt welche, die kommen zu uns und wollen uns nicht gestatten unsere Kultur auszuleben, bspw. sollen die Kruzifixe aus Klassenräumen entfernt werden. Das geht nicht!“ (TP 04)

- *„I don't see how German culture is undermined by immigrants. It may be that the immigrants do not want to accept German culture, but I think that is perfectly fine, because they have their own culture. I also did not want to give up all my rights when I go to an Islamic country. I understood the question as if German culture would be destroyed to a certain extent by immigration. And I do not think that.“⁵² (TP 07)*

The other 14 test persons rather think of a "passive" disappearance or getting lost of the German culture, which – if at all – could happen due to the lack of interest of the Germans in preserving their own culture:

- *„If we Germans cultivate our culture, then I see no problem.“⁵³ (TP 05)*
- *„Our culture becomes richer by coming into contact with other cultures, and so each culture can develop further, and it is more likely to become an international culture if it mixes. I don't think that the Germans will lose their own culture because of that.“⁵⁴ (TP 06)*
- *„In big cities it looks like this. If there is a kebab stand on every corner, it looks like German culture is getting lost. If you go out a little bit, then you see German culture again. For me it has not been lost. You have to drive down the German wine street and then you have the German culture again.“⁵⁵ (TP 09)*
- *„I am undecided whether we as Germans allow our culture to be undermined. We must see for ourselves that we uphold our culture. If we uphold our own culture, no matter what one understands by it, religion, education and whatever belongs to culture, this cannot be undermined either.“⁵⁶ (TP 15)*

Two test persons (TP 11, TP 18) seem to have interpreted the term "undermining culture" not in the intended sense but only as "non-adaptation" to German culture. For both of them it remains unclear whether this "non-adaptation" has a direct effect on the continued existence of German culture or not:

⁵² „Ich wüsste nicht, wie die deutsche Kultur durch Zuwanderer untergraben wird. Es kann gemeint sein, dass die Zuwanderer die deutsche Kultur nicht annehmen wollen, aber das finde ich vollkommen in Ordnung, weil die ja ihre eigene haben. Ich wollte auch nicht, wenn ich in ein islamisches Land gehe, alle meine Rechte aufgeben wollen. Ich habe die Frage so verstanden, als würde die deutsche Kultur ein Stück weit durch Zuwanderung vernichtet werden. Und das finde ich nicht.“ (TP 07)

⁵³ „Wenn wir Deutschen unsere Kultur pflegen, dann sehe ich da kein Problem.“ (TP 05)

⁵⁴ „Unsere Kultur wird dadurch reicher, dass sie mit anderen Kulturen in Verbindung kommt und dass sich so jede Kultur weiterentwickeln kann und es eher eine internationale Kultur wird, wenn sich das vermischt. Ich denke nicht, dass die Deutschen dadurch ihre eigene Kultur verlieren.“ (TP 06)

⁵⁵ „In Großstädten sieht es danach aus. Wenn an jeder Ecke eine Dönerbude ist, dann sieht es so aus als geht die deutsche Kultur verloren. Wenn man ein bisschen rausfährt, dann sieht man wieder die deutsche Kultur. Für mich ist die nicht verloren gegangen. Man muss mal die deutsche Weinstraße runter fahren und dann hat man wieder die deutsche Kultur.“ (TP 09)

⁵⁶ „Ich bin unentschieden, ob wir als Deutsche uns unsere Kultur untergraben lassen. Wir müssen selbst schauen, dass wir unsere Kultur hochhalten. Wenn wir unsere eigene Kultur, egal was man darunter versteht, Religion, Bildung und was auch immer zur Kultur gehört, selbst hochhalten, kann das auch nicht untergraben werden.“ (TP 15)

- *„I have now seen it in such a way that they do not adapt to our culture. They don't have to go to religious instruction. And if I go abroad, nobody will build churches, we'll build mosques here. If they are here and want to live here, then they just have to adapt.“⁵⁷ (TP 11)*
- *„That depends. Where I live, there are people who make their own culture, they raise their own culture. A different culture is opened up in the middle of Germany, they don't fit in at all. None of them learn German, they only speak Albanian and open up their own culture, it's not possible. And then there are groups who speak German and adapt to the German conditions. I don't have to adapt to them, they have to adapt to me, they come here. Many adapt, some do not adapt at all.“⁵⁸ (TP 18)*

Item h): Legal immigrants should have the same opportunities for school education as Germans.

All test persons agree or fully agree with the statement.

All 20 test persons interpret the term "opportunities for school education" as access to educational opportunities and thus in the sense intended by the researchers:

- *„This is particularly important. If the immigrants do not receive the same school education, then one has exactly the problem that at some point these pupils, children, young people do not know the German language, cannot integrate into society. Then the Germans will complain that no integration has taken place and then you would be back in this cycle.“⁵⁹ (TP 09)*
- *„Education is the be-all and end-all. This is the basis for them to be able to live here and to integrate themselves here; they must have the same school education.“⁶⁰ (TP 17)*

There are differences between the test persons regarding the interpretation of the term "school education". Five test persons only think of school in the narrower sense of the term, i.e. primary and lower secondary education (primary school, Hauptschule, Realschule, Gymnasium, Gesamtschule). The other 15 test persons include additional areas such as kindergarten, university, vocational training and further education.

However, the answers of the test persons show that there is no connection between the interpretation of the term "school education" (narrow versus broad interpretation) and the agreement on item h). All 20 test persons agree or fully agree with the statement, regardless of whether they only think of ac-

⁵⁷ „Ich habe es jetzt so gesehen, dass die sich nicht unserer Kultur anpassen. Die müssen nicht in den Religionsunterricht. Und wenn ich ins Ausland gehe, da baut keiner Kirchen, wir bauen hier Moscheen. Wenn die hier sind und hier leben wollen, dann müssen die sich einfach anpassen.“ (TP 11)

⁵⁸ „Es kommt darauf an. Da wo ich wohne, da gibt es Leute, die machen eine eigene Kultur, die ziehen sich eine eigene Kultur auf. Da wird mitten in Deutschland ein anderer Kulturkreis eröffnet, die passen überhaupt nicht. Die lernen alle kein Deutsch, die reden nur albanisch und machen ihre eigenen Kulturkreise auf, das geht gar nicht. Und dann gibt es Gruppen, die sprechen deutsch, passen sich den deutschen Gegebenheiten an. Ich muss mich nicht denen anpassen, die müssen sich mir anpassen, die kommen hier her. Viele passen sich an, manche passen sich gar nicht an.“ (TP 18)

⁵⁹ „Das ist besonders wichtig. Wenn die Zuwanderer nicht die gleiche Schulbildung bekommen, dann hat man genau das Problem, dass irgendwann diese Schüler, Kinder, Jugendliche die deutsche Sprache nicht beherrschen, sich in die Gesellschaft nicht integrieren können. Dann beschwerten sich die Deutschen wiederum, dass keine Integration stattgefunden hat und dann wäre man wieder in diesem Kreislauf.“ (TP 09)

⁶⁰ „Bildung ist das A und O. Das ist der Grundstock, damit sie hier leben können und sich hier integrieren können; sie müssen dieselbe Schulbildung haben.“ (TP 17)

cess to grades 1 to 13 or whether they also include access to further education. The statements of the 15 respondents, who interpret the term rather broadly, suggest that they do not distinguish between different educational areas but rather make a general judgement about access to educational opportunities.

Recommendations:

Question: No changes recommended.

Item a) – c): No changes recommended. Although some test persons find the term "immigrant" too imprecise, querying individual immigrant groups does not appear to be a suitable alternative, since in this case the intended construct (ethnic assimilation/ethnic pluralism) would probably no longer be measured.

Item e): No changes recommended.

Item h): No changes recommended.

Question to be tested:

6. Welche der folgenden Aussagen über Zuwanderer kommt Ihren Ansichten am nächsten?

[Which of the following statements about immigrants comes closest to your views?]

(Nur EIN Kreuz möglich!)

[Only ONE cross possible!]

Frequency distribution (N = 20)

Zuwanderer sollten ihre eigene Kultur bewahren und nicht die deutsche Kultur übernehmen.	-
[Immigrants should preserve their own culture and not adopt German culture.]	
Zuwanderer sollten sowohl ihre eigene Kultur bewahren als auch die deutsche Kultur übernehmen.	19
[Immigrants should both preserve their own culture and adopt German culture.]	
Zuwanderer sollten ihre eigene Kultur aufgeben und die deutsche Kultur übernehmen.	-
[Immigrants should give up their own culture and adopt the German culture.]	
Kann ich nicht sagen.	1
[Don't know]	

Cognitive techniques:

General Probing, Specific Probing.

Findings:

With the exception of one test person (TP 05), all but one of the test persons choose the middle category, indicating that they believe that immigrants should both preserve their own culture and adopt German culture. Test person 05 sees a logical contradiction in this answer category, since according to their understanding, "taking something over" is always only possible if "something is given" in return:

- „If the question were to be that one takes over certain criteria from another cultural area and keeps its own, then I would fully agree with that. But that is not how I understand the question here. Preserving one's own culture and taking over another culture, that doesn't go together. If you take over certain parts, a variation or a mix, I would fully support that. If you add something new, then you have to give something else away.“⁶¹ (TP 05)

⁶¹ „Wenn die Fragestellung wäre, dass man bestimmte Kriterien von einem anderen Kulturkreis übernimmt und seine behält, dann würde ich dem voll zustimmen. Aber so verstehe ich die Frage hier nicht. Die eigene Kultur bewahren und eine andere übernehmen, das passt nicht zusammen. Wenn

Test person 15 also feels a similar contradiction, at least with regard to different religions. Nevertheless, she chooses the middle category:

- *„I cannot do both: take over the German culture and preserve the old culture. You can live together without any problems. If I see this from the perspective of a Turk, he can't preserve his own culture as a Muslim AND take over German [Christianity] - when it comes to religion. To culture there is also music etc., but from the point of view of religion it doesn't fit together. Either the one or the other.“⁶² (TP 15)*

Two test persons (TP 07, TP 13) state that they would struggle with the word "take over" as this would express a somewhat too strong demand. Test person 07 suggests the word "accept" as an alternative.

When asked what specific "behavior" the respondents had in mind when answering the question, various aspects of culture are mentioned that can be adopted or retained: cultural practices (e.g., smoking a water pipe), national dishes, customs and festivals (e.g., Ramadan, carnival processions, Christmas cookies), languages, and religious or cultural values.

Recommendations:

Question: No changes recommended.

Response Options: The term "adopt" could be replaced by "accept".

man bestimmte Teile übernimmt, eine Variation bzw. einen Mix, das würde ich voll unterstützen. Wenn man etwas Neues hinzunimmt, dann muss man was anderes abgeben." (TP 05)

⁶² „Ich kann nicht beides: die deutsche Kultur übernehmen und die alte Kultur bewahren. Man kann zusammen leben ohne dass es Probleme gibt. Wenn ich das aus der Sicht eines Türken sehe, kann er nicht die eigene Kultur als Moslem bewahren UND die deutsche [das Christentum] übernehmen – wenn es um Religion geht. Zu Kultur gehört auch noch Musik etc., aber von Seiten der Religion gesehen passt das nicht zusammen. Entweder das eine oder das andere." (TP 15)

Question to be tested:

7. Inwieweit stimmen Sie der Aussage zu, dass starke patriotische Gefühle in Deutschland...

[To what extent do you agree with the statement that strong patriotic feelings in Germany...

(Bitte machen Sie in JEDER Zeile ein Kreuz!)

[Please put a cross in EVERY line!]

Frequency distribution (N = 20)

	Stimme voll und ganz zu [Strongly agree]	Stimme zu [Agree]	Weder noch [Neither nor]	Stimme nicht zu [Disagree]	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu [Strongly disagree]	Kann ich nicht sagen [Don't know]
a) die Stellung Deutschlands in der Welt stärken? [strengthen Germany's position in the world?]	-	6	2	8	1	3
b) zu Intoleranz in Deutschland führen? [lead to intolerance in Germany?]	1	8	3	3	1	4
e) für den nationalen Zusammenhalt Deutschlands nötig sind? [are necessary for the national cohesion of Germany?]	1	8	7	1	1	2
d) zu einer negativen Einstellung gegenüber Zuwanderern in Deutschland führen? [lead to a negative attitude towards immigrants in Germany?]	2	8	3	3	1	3

Cognitive techniques:

Comprehension Probing, Specific Probing, General Probing.

Findings:

It was systematically investigated how the test persons understand the formulation "strong patriotic feelings" in the question. In order to obtain more detailed information on the understanding of this term, the test persons were also asked to explain their answers to item d) in more detail (general probing).

There are basically two different interpretations of the term "patriotic feelings". On the one hand, patriotism is perceived with a positive connotation in the sense of patriotism, national pride, attachment to one's own people or community within a nation. On the other hand, there is a negative perception in the sense of nationalism, i.e. an exaggeration of one's own nation while at the same time belittling other nations or peoples. In this context the test persons can be divided into three groups. Eight test persons (TP 03, TP 06, TP 10, TP 14, TP 17, TP 18, TP 19, TP 20) can be assigned to the group that thought of the positive connotation of the term when answering the item battery. Apart from TP 19, these test persons tend not to agree with item d). Those who feel a "healthy patriotism" (TP 15) do not assume that this feeling leads to a negative attitude towards immigrants in Germany.

Three test persons associate the term "patriotic feelings" with a national socialist attitude or "blindness" (TP 05), therefore they fully agree with question d) or indicate to test person 12 that they could not say this.

Apart from test person 02, who confuses "patriot" with "pacifist" and therefore chooses "Can't say", the remaining eight test persons (TP 01, TP 04, TP 07, TP 08, TP 09, TP 13, TP 15, TP 16) combine the two different connotations of the term. Especially within this third group, five test persons (TP 07, TP 08, TP 13, TP 16, TP 19) ask the question where the borderline between "strong" and "too strong" patriotic feelings, which are initially positive and can then turn into a negative, runs:

- *„Here I have the problem with 'strong' and 'too strong'. [...] That 'strong' turns patriotic feelings into something negative, only patriotic feelings would be something like national pride without any valuation.“⁶³ (TP 19)*
- *„It says 'strong patriotic feelings', so [I] had a little difficulty with that. Strong patriotic feelings are strong patriotic feelings. I'm thinking of [...] national socialist feelings and that's why it hurt me a bit, the 'strong' feelings.“⁶⁴ (TP 07)*
- *„The fact that you are very strongly committed to your nation and that you carry this to the outside world, be it, for example, through the German flag that you hang in your garden. That one expresses that one feels connected with the country. Difficult because of the past, therefore still rather negatively occupied, you always think the same way, if you carry that too strongly to the outside, you are immediately put into a Nazi corner. That has changed a bit, also because of the World Cup, but I think it is still rather negative. Because they say here, strong patriotic feelings, that the more extreme level is chosen and that you're seen as xenophobic and that leads to a negative attitude towards immigrants.“⁶⁵ (TP 08)*

⁶³ „Hier habe ich das Problem mit ‚stark‘ und ‚zu stark‘. [...] Dass ‚starke‘ macht die patriotischen Gefühle zu etwas Negativem, nur patriotische Gefühle wären ohne Wertung etwas wie Nationalstolz.“ (TP 19)

⁶⁴ „Da steht ‚starke patriotische Gefühle‘, deswegen [...] habe [ich] mich damit etwas schwer getan. Starke patriotische Gefühle sind halt starke patriotische Gefühle. Ich denke da halt an [...] nationalsozialistische Gefühle und deswegen tat mir das etwas weh, das ‚starke‘.“ (TP 07)

⁶⁵ „Dass man sehr stark zu seiner Nation bekennt und das auch nach außen trägt, sei es z.B. durch die Deutschlandfahne, die man in den Garten hängt. Dass man zum Ausdruck bringt, dass man sich mit dem Land verbunden fühlt. Schwierig durch die Vergangenheit, deswegen eher noch negativ be-

- „Too strong patriotic feelings can lead to a negative attitude.“⁶⁶ (TP 13)
- „I'm a little ambivalent about that. [...] I think a certain amount of patriotism is justified and then you can also be tolerant towards other people who live here. But extreme patriotism, of course, is such that no one else is allowed to live here. I find that a bit difficult to define. When you say 'strong patriotic feelings', it can be quite extreme, but it can also be that you still tolerate others.“⁶⁷

These explanations of the test persons' understanding of the question make it clear that the use of the term "patriotic feelings" in combination with "strong" turns the positive connotation into the opposite.

Item a): strengthen the position of Germany in the world?

Three test subjects choose "Can't say." While test person 01 and test person 10 state not to know what influence strong patriotic feelings have on Germany's position in the world, test person 11 is unclear to what extent there is "any connection between the two."

Item b): lead to intolerance in Germany?

For this item, four test persons stated that they could not say this. The reasons for this are very different. Subject 02 confuses "patriot" with "pacifist", so the question makes no sense to them. Test person 06 wonders who could develop intolerance towards. Test person 07 makes the answer to the question dependent on what image of Germany one has: *"It depends on what I see Germany as and we are simply a strong immigration country and we have a lot of migrants. And I personally also think that they are one of them. In this respect, strong patriotic feelings in an immigration country would never lead to intolerance, but rather the opposite. But I don't know whether someone who asks the question like this has the same thought [Germany as an immigration country]. If you see Germany purely as Germany without all the foreigners, then strong patriotic feelings would naturally lead to intolerance. It depends on which Germany you want to feel you belong to. That's why I couldn't say it."*⁶⁸

setzt, man denkt immer gleich, wenn man das zu stark nach außen trägt, wird man gleich in eine Nazi-Ecke gesteckt. Das hat sich ein bisschen gewandelt auch durch die WM, aber ich denke, es ist immer noch eher negativ besetzt. Da man hier sagt, starke patriotische Gefühle, dass da die extremere Stufe gewählt ist und dass man dann eher als fremdenfeindlich angesehen wird und das zu einer negativen Einstellung gegenüber Zuwanderern führt." (TP 08)

⁶⁶ „Zu starke patriotische Gefühle können zu einer negativen Einstellung führen.“ (TP 13)

⁶⁷ „Da bin ich ein bisschen in einem Zwiespalt. [...] Ich denke, ein gewisses Maß an Patriotismus ist berechtigt und dann kann man auch tolerant sein gegenüber anderen Menschen, die hier leben. Aber ganz extremer Patriotismus, das ist natürlich so, dass dann kein anderer mehr zugelassen wird. Also das finde ich ein bisschen schwierig, dass da jetzt abzugrenzen. Wenn man sagt ‚starke patriotische Gefühle‘ dann kann das ganz extrem sein, es kann aber auch so sein, dass man andere noch toleriert.“

⁶⁸ „Da kommt es darauf an, als was ich Deutschland sehe und wir sind einfach ein starkes Einwanderungsland und wir haben sehr viele Migranten. Und ich persönlich finde auch, dass die dazu gehören. Insofern würden starke patriotische Gefühle in einem Einwanderungsland niemals zu Intoleranz führen, sondern eher genau das Gegenteil. Ich weiß allerdings nicht, ob jemand, der die Frage so stellt, den gleichen Gedanken hat [Deutschland als Einwanderungsland]. Wenn man Deutschland rein als Deutschland sieht ohne die ganzen Ausländer, dann würden starke patriotische Gefühle natürlich zu Intoleranz führen. Es kommt darauf an, zu welchem Deutschland möchte man sich zugehörig fühlen. Deswegen konnte ich es nicht sagen.“ (TP 07)

Test person 16 chooses the *"I couldn't say it"* category because it fluctuates between two interpretations of the phrase *"strong patriotic feelings"*: If the interpretation is based on the meaning of "national pride", this promotes tolerance in Germany, but if the phrase is interpreted in such a way that it is too strong feelings in the sense of "extremism" or "National Socialism", this leads quasi automatically to intolerance in Germany.

Recommendations:

- Question: Rephrase or delete the increase "strong":
"To what extent do you agree with the statement that patriotic feelings in Germany..."
[„Inwieweit stimmen Sie der Aussage zu, dass patriotische Gefühle in Deutschland..."]
- Item a): No changes recommended.
- Item b): No changes recommended.